

December 18, 1950

Dr. William L. Langer

[Redacted]

Dear Bill:

Your letter of December 12th has come. I wish it had arrived Thursday for we had a meeting of the Committee on Studies Thursday night and I would have liked to have read it to the members. However, I shall send copies to them at once.

I am sorry that you read insinuations into my letter. I assure you none were intended.

We discussed the project at length and I must tell you at once that the Committee is prepared to deal as generously with you and Gleason as the funds permit. They are prepared to ask the Foundation for an extension of time for the use of the balance, but feel that if this request is to be granted we ought to be able to give the Foundation dates for the publication of the volumes, particularly of the first one.

If you will let me know the approximate dates when you can turn in the manuscripts, we shall proceed at once.

Sincerely yours,

Walter H. Mallory
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

P.S. I was distressed to hear that the State Department has still not granted full clearance. I had understood from Kennan that he had arranged for it in September.

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGES IN CLASS. ☒
CLASS. _____
EXT. _____
AUTH. _____
DATE: 26 MAR 61

[Redacted]

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, INC.
THE HAROLD PRATT HOUSE 58 EAST 68TH STREET
NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

December 18, 1950

Allen W. Dulles, Esq.
1718 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Allen:

I send you herewith copies of an exchange of letters with Langer. Ham Armstrong tells me that you are meeting him on Tuesday or Wednesday. You will want to look at these before then. I also enclose a copy of a letter from George Kennan which Langer sent me concerning State Department clearance. I believe Ham told you about this, and both he and I thought that the matter was settled.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

W. H. Mallory
Walter H. Mallory
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

47
RECEIVED
NO. 100-100000
DATE: 26 MAR 81
L17

ILLEGIB

December 5, 1950

Dr. William L. Langer

Dear Bill:

I hope you will forgive me for taking so long to reply to your letter of November 24th. Meanwhile Cass Canfield has sent me copies of his exchange of letters with you concerning the titles. I think also that the sub-title is rather long and dull, but I don't think this is important as long as it is a sub-title. What must not be dull is the title of the individual volume which is the one that is used in reviews and on lists; and those suggested by Cass seemed to me to be good. If the title which carries the book is good, the sub-title can be descriptive and perhaps ought to be.

Caruthers tells me that beginning last April your honorarium became \$166.66 a month which was the difference between your salary here and your salary at Harvard. However, this was not put into effect until April 30 when you had already received \$1250. This, therefore, constituted payment in advance and carried through half of November. I understand that a check for the balance of November, \$83.28, has now been mailed to you. Now that you have gone to Washington, I suppose that the salary thing has all been thrown out of gear, but I suggest that we continue until the end of 1950 at the rate of \$166.66 a month. We are continuing Gleason at the rate of \$150 a month for the same period.

I am not sure what the Committee will want to do about the period after January 1st when the present Foundation grant expires. We have already assumed the rent in Cambridge for the rest of the year's lease, and an unspecified amount for Miss Carney. I know the Committee wanted to try to reserve some funds to help with the distribution of the book. This won't leave much of a balance even if the Committee did agree to go back to the Foundation for an extension. It would be particularly difficult to do that in view of the fact that after more than four and a half years of work there would still be nothing to show the Foundation but an unfinished text of volume I in mimeographed form.

I have appreciated the difficulties which you encountered as you went along and have been glad to act as middle-man in explaining them to the Committee, but I am frank to say that this gets increasingly difficult. The Council has a responsibility to the Foundation to account for the expenditure of \$149,000. It is becoming increasingly embarrassed by the fact that your original plan as presented to the Rockefeller Foundation for three volumes to cover the full period of the war, and even your later modified plan for two volumes to cover down only to Pearl Harbor, have still not resulted in even one finished volume; and so far you have not set a date for the delivery of the first manuscript.

DOCUMENT NO. 48
NO CHANGES IN INDEX
☐ INDEX
☐ CLASSIFIED
☐ NEXT

-2-

These must be very trying days for you as they will be for everybody else in the United States before many weeks pass.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

Walter H. Mallory
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

P.S. I presume that you have notified Miss Carney that her check on December 15th will be the last on a salary basis, and that you will send us vouchers for any part-time work which she does thereafter.

STAT

12 December 1950

Walter H. Mallory, Esq.
Council on Foreign Relations
58 East 68th Street
New York 21, N.Y.

DOCUMENT NO. 49
RE CLASS. IN CLAS. PC
☐ DECLASS.
CLASS. BY
DATE: 26 MAR 88

STAT

Dear Walter:

The fact that both Gleason and I are spending long and rather nerve-racking days at the office and then devoting practically every evening and weekends to work on the project may be making us hyper-sensitive, but it seems to us that your letter of 5 December is a rather ungracious one. I It seems to contain the insinuation that during the last several years we have been dawdling along spending a lot of money and producing very little in return. I can hardly believe that such an insinuation was intended, but let me say very emphatically that I have rarely worked so hard on anything as I have on this project, and that on many an occasion I have asked myself why in the world I did it.

I have tried to keep you regularly informed on the development of the project, and it seems to me that you ought to be able to recall how, from the very outset, the enterprise has grown and grown far beyond anything that could have been anticipated in 1946. As you know very well, one of the basic difficulties has arisen from the fact that such rich materials were made available to us. These materials have made it possible for us to write a much better book than we could have hoped to write, and it has always been our supposition that the Council shared our gratification on this score. In any event, it was none of our fault that the materials assumed such mountainous proportions, and we certainly never felt, as scholars, that we could simply ignore the evidence in order the more quickly to finish the job.

I can only assume that both you and the members of the Committee on Studies have read all or part of the manuscript, but on that assumption I do not see how you can possibly talk about "an unfinished text of volume I in mimeographed form". Volume I was in shape for the publisher last September, and if it has not yet gone to him, the explanation is simply that we have wanted to incorporate the suggestions made by numerous readers and, more importantly, that thus far the State Department has cleared only Chapters I through III and V through X. I think you must know that I have been exerting every effort to speed action by the State Department and that it is not due to any negligence on my part that clearance has not been obtained. Gleason and I are trying to see Freeman Matthews this week in the hope of enlisting aid at a higher level, but in any event, you can hardly make us responsible for the delay, in some cases running now to nine months, on the part of the State Department authorities.

Another statement in your letter seems to me to be utterly misleading. It is true that originally we had hoped to write a three-volume work covering the entire war period. It very quickly became apparent that that objective could not possibly be attained, and we were therefore obliged to restrict our study to the period prior to Pearl Harbor. The finished

-2-

text of the first volume as it now stands runs to about 375,000 words which is the length of more than three ordinary volumes. The second volume, which is of about equal length, is completely written and requires only revision. In other words, as I figure it, we have, in terms of production, accomplished just about twice what we had hoped to do. It has always been my assumption that the Council wanted a thorough scholarly job. Thus far, everybody has been in complete agreement on the scale of the study and on its general character. Under the circumstances, I find it difficult to believe now that the Council just wanted to get out three volumes of some kind or another to meet a deadline.

If your Committee is not fully aware of these considerations, I think it should not be difficult for you to explain them. Neither do I see that, under the circumstances, it is such an embarrassing thing to ask the Foundation for an extension of the grant. After all, if the Council is to engage in work of this magnitude and caliber, it cannot expect the product to be thumped out to meet deadlines. This project is as much the Council's project as it is ours. As a matter of fact, it was suggested by the Council, and I think as authors we have every right to expect that the Council will give us all necessary support.

On the financial end, I don't know what to say. The sum that you are now paying Gleason and myself is the merest pittance considering the sacrifices we are making. I had hoped that the Council would not expect two men already very heavily burdened with very exacting government work to spend every scrap of spare time on this project without at least a token payment, but your Committee will have to decide what it wants to do about this.

About all I can say is that when you strike an aggrieved tone in your letter it tends to get my back up. Gleason and I are the ones who have actually carried the very heavy burden on this project, and it is highly disappointing to us, to say the least, to find that there is apparently so little recognition of our efforts on the part of the Council.

Very sincerely yours,

(signed) William L. Langer

William L. Langer.

September 29, 1950

NO 2.

10

Figure 1

125

ALFA

DATE:

STAT

✻ ✻ ✻ ✻ ✻ ✻

George F. Kennan

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, INC.
58 EAST 68TH STREET, NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

BY HAND

Allen W. Dulles, Esq.
239 East 61st Street

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
Study Group on Aid to Europe

Twentieth Meeting, 12-11-50

- ✓ General Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chairman
- ✓ Hamilton Fish Armstrong
- ✓ Allen W. Dulles
- Edward Mead Earle
- George S. Franklin, Jr.
- Edwin C. Hoyt, Jr.
- Walter H. Mallory
- ✓ Stacy May
- ✓ Philip D. Reed
- ✓ Henry M. Wriston

*William
Viner
Baldwin
Rabi
[Kerman]*

Research Staff

Percy W. Bidwell
William Diebold, Jr.
Arthur S. Nevins
Lindsay Rogers

51
DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☒
☐ RECLASSIFIED
DATE: 26 MAR 81

ILLEGIB